

### **Remarks**

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 9-16 and 27-32 have been canceled. Claims 1-8 and 17-26 remain pending.

5

### **Statement of Substance of Interview dated 12/17/07**

Initially, Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Augustine for conducting a telephonic interview with Applicant's attorney, Daniel T. McGinnity, on 12/17/07.

10 In the interview, Applicant's attorney submitted the differences between the cited reference Broussard and the claimed subject matter. In particular, Applicant discussed "legacy windows" as recited in the claims which Applicant asserts is not shown by the references of record. Broussard also fails to disclose, teach or suggest at least "determining if a child window of a parent window is a legacy window" and "causing the child window output to be redirected to an off-screen  
15 buffer" as recited in claim 1. Further, Broussard does not describe "applying a visual enhancement to the child window output" as also recited in claim 1.

Nevertheless, in the interest of expediting allowance of the subject application and without conceding the propriety of the rejection, Applicant's attorney proposed amendments to clarify the differences discussed during the  
20 interview. Examiner Augustine acknowledged the differences and tentatively agreed that the clarifying amendments would overcome the rejections based on Broussard, subject to review of formally submitted amendments.

Accordingly, amendments have been made to the independent claims herein in the spirit of those discussed during the interview. The Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If any issues remain that would prevent the allowance of the application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issues.

### **35 U.S.C. §101 Rejections**

Claims 8, 16, 17, 22 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, appropriate correction is made herein as reflected in the foregoing amendments to the claims. Accordingly, the §112 rejections have been obviated.

### **35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections**

Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0184409 to Broussard et al. ("Broussard").

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, in the interest of expediting allowance of the subject application and without conceding the propriety of the rejections, amendments have been made to independent claims 1, 17, and 22 herein in the spirit of those discussed during the interview. Without conceding the propriety of the rejections, claim 9-16 and 27-32 have been canceled without prejudice to reduce outstanding issues.

## The Claim Amendments

In the interest of expediting allowance of the subject application and without conceding the propriety of the rejection, amendments have been made to the independent claims herein in the spirit of those discussed during the interview.

In particular, independent claims 1, 17, and 22 have been amended herein to clarify arrangement of multiple child windows within a parent window, such that enhanced functionality available to the parent window is made available to legacy windows contained by the parent that do not natively support the enhanced functionality. Claim 8 has been amended into independent form. For example:

**Claim 1** as amended (portions of the amendment appear in bold/italics) recites a computer-executable method, comprising:

- *arranging a parent window to contain a plurality of child windows;*
- *providing via the arranging enhanced functionality available to the parent window to one or more legacy windows of the contained plurality of child windows that do not natively support the enhanced functionality by, for each of the plurality of child windows:*
  - determining if the child window of the parent window is a legacy window *that does not natively support the enhanced functionality;*
  - if so, causing the child window output to be redirected to an off-screen buffer;
  - retrieving the child window output from the off-screen buffer; and
  - applying a visual enhancement to the child window output through the enhanced functionality available to the parent window; and
- *composing a visual representation of the parent window having the visually enhanced child window output corresponding to each child window determined to be a legacy window.*

**Claim 8** has been amended into independent form to recite computer-readable medium executable to perform acts similar to those of method claim 1.

**Claim 17** as amended (portions of the amendment appear in bold/italics) recites an apparatus comprising:

- a processor, and
- memory storing components executable via the processor, the components including:
  - a user component configured to create an off-screen buffer upon detecting the presence of a legacy child window of a parent window;
  - a GDI component configured *to redirect window output from the legacy child window to the off-screen buffer* upon being notified by the user component of the existence of the legacy child window; and
  - a MIL component configured *to retrieve the redirected window output from the off-screen buffer and apply a visual enhancement* to the redirected window output in connection with composing the parent window for display on a display device,
  - *wherein the parent window is arranged to:*
    - *contain a plurality of child windows;*
    - *support enhanced functionality available through the MIL component; and*
    - *enable the enhanced functionality available through the MIL component to visually enhance one or more legacy child windows of the contained plurality of child windows that do not natively support the enhanced functionality of the MIL component.*

**Claim 22** as amended (portions of the amendment appear in bold/italics) recites a computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions stored thereon, that when executed direct a computer to perform acts comprising:

- *redirecting a child window of a parent window to an off-screen buffer responsive to determining that the child window is a legacy window that does not natively support enhanced functionality, wherein the parent window does natively supports the enhanced functionality;*
- issuing instructions to notify the parent window that the redirected child window is being or has been set up;
- *retrieving the redirected child window from the off-screen buffer; and*
- *applying a visual enhancement to the redirected child window through the enhanced functionality available from the parent window.*

Support for the amendments may be found throughout the specification and drawings as filed. Particular attention is drawn to FIG. 4 and p. 10 line 10 – p. 12 line 4. These portions describe examples of using a MIL component of a parent window to provide enhanced functionality to legacy windows within the spirit of the amendments made to the independent claims.

As discussed in the interview, Broussard does not disclose, teach, or suggest any such subject matter. Reference is made to Broussard paragraphs [0080]-[0093], which describe the techniques of Broussard. In particular, to create a platform independent look and feel, Broussard discusses creating a proxy object for an object to be drawn. Specifically, these techniques involve using a peer that is written entirely in Java for the object. The peer then routes location and event status for the object to proxy object which responds to the events. When the object is to be drawn, the proxy object is drawn instead. Thus, what Broussard describes is a substitution of a proxy object for another object. However, this substitution is not fairly considered applying a visual enhancement to the object. Rather, the object is discarded in favor of the proxy. Still further, the proxy objects appear to be used to directly to draw the output.

Thus, part of what Broussard lacks relative to the claimed subject matter is drawing of legacy components into a buffer, retrieving the buffered legacy components from the buffer, and applying visual enhancements to the legacy components. Simply put, Broussard is directed a different techniques, performed

in a different manner to achieve different results than the disclosed and claimed subject matter.

In making out the rejections, paragraphs [0057]-[0058] are cited for “determining if a child window of a parent window is a legacy window”. However these portions of Broussard merely provide a general discussion regarding the flaws of AWT and a description of a computer. However, there is no mention of a determination as to whether a child window is a legacy window.

With respect to “causing the child window output to be redirected to an off-screen buffer” FIG. 14 of Broussard is cited. However, FIG. 14 merely shows normal screen buffering used in all cases. That is, the depicted buffer is a screen buffer and not an off-screen buffer as recited. Further, this is buffering by default performed for all components (paragraph [0131]) and accordingly is not responsive to a determining step. FIG. 14 does not provide a basis for applying a visual enhancement to the buffer before output to the display. As such, the basis given for “retrieving the child window output from the off-screen buffer” and “applying a visual enhancement to the child window” is faulty.

With respect to “applying a visual enhancement to the child window” and “composing a visual representation of the parent window with the visually enhanced child window output” paragraphs [0061]-[0064] of Broussard are cited. However, rather than discussing application of visual enhancements or even the techniques of Broussard itself, these portions of Broussard appear to be general background that describes the dependence of the appearance of Java applications

and controls on a specific operating system or platform used to execute the applications. Thus, it is not clear how the Examiner arrives at the recited features from the description in paragraphs [0061]-[0064].

Moreover, Broussard is entirely silent as to the subject matter of the amendments made to the independent claims. For instance, (1) arranging a parent window to contain a plurality of child windows and (2) providing via the arranging enhanced functionality available to the parent window to one or more legacy windows of the contained plurality of child windows that do not natively support the enhanced functionality” as in claim 1 (emphasis added). Further, Broussard does not discuss, for each of the plurality of child windows determining which are legacy windows, and redirecting the legacy windows to an off-screen buffer to permit visual enhancements, as further recited in claim 1. As noted, Broussard describes substitution of a proxy object for another object. It does not appear that these substitutions in Broussard occur through rendering to an off-screen buffer. In any event, the substitution of one item for another is not a visual enhancement of the item. Further, the buffer relied upon in FIG. 14 is a screen buffer not an off-screen buffer as previously discussed. Claim 1 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Claim 8 has been amended into independent form and recites computer readable medium having features similar to those of method claim 1. Thus, claim 8 is allowable based on similar reasoning. Similar reasoning also applies to the

features presently recited in claims 17 and 22, in varying terms and scope.  
Accordingly, Broussard does not anticipate the claims as presently recited.

Claims 1, 8, 17, and 22 and their respective dependent claims are allowable  
over Broussard for at least the foregoing reasons and withdrawal of the §102  
5 rejections is respectfully requested.

### **Conclusion**

The Application is in condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully  
requests reconsideration and issuance of the present application. Should any issue  
10 remain that prevents immediate issuance of the application, the Examiner is  
requested to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss the unresolved issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/10/08

By: /Daniel T. McGinnity, #55444/

Daniel T. McGinnity

Reg. No. 55444

Attorney for Applicant

Sadler, Breen, Morasch & Colby, PS

422 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 424

Spokane, Washington 99201

Telephone: (509) 755-7257

Facsimile: (509) 755-7252